REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected as being anticipated by Yazaki. Claim 1 is not anticipated by Yazaki. Our reasoning for this is set out below. As such, we believe there is no need to amend independent claim 1 in view of this citation.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of flow control in a packet switch. The method involves classifying an incoming packet according to its priority based on predefined rules to produce a lifetime value associated with the packet. The packet and its associated lifetime value are sent to a queue, the lifetime value is periodically changed, and the changed value is compared to a threshold value. The packet is removed from the queue based on the comparison.

Yazaki discloses a packet shaping unit 500 equipped with a packet storage FIFO buffer 520 to store packets, a bandwidth check unit 600 to decide the priority of queuing the packets as high or low, and a packet discard control unit 510 to judge whether a packet is to be stored in the packet storage FIFO buffer 520 or discarded, based on the queuing priority of the

packet (see column 2, lines 54-59; column 5 line 23 to column 7 line 33; and FIG. 5 of Yazaki).

Although Yazaki discloses a bandwidth check unit 600 that classifies an incoming packet according to its priority, the bandwidth check unit 600 classifies the incoming packet based on user-specific minimum bandwidth: an incoming packet is classified as a "high priority" packet if the packet falls within the minimum bandwidth and a "low priority" packet if the packet falls outside the minimum bandwidth (see column 5, lines 35-39 and column 5, line 64 to column 6, line 2 of Yazaki). Clearly, Yazaki does not disclose classifying an incoming packet according to its priority based on predefined rules to produce a lifetime value associated with the packet as recited in Claim 1.

Additionally, Yazaki only discloses sending a packet to a queue (i.e. the packet storage FIFO buffer 520) (see column 5, lines 26-34 of Yazaki), but not a lifetime value associated with the packet to the queue 520 as claimed in Claim 1.

Yazaki also does not disclose periodically changing the lifetime value and comparing the changed value to a threshold value as recited in claim 1. In contrast, Yazaki discloses a discard decision circuit 512 that decides whether to discard a packet stored in a temporary buffer 511 by comparing the

respective thresholds for high and low priority packets with the number of packets in the queue (i.e. the value of a FIFO counter 513) (see column 5, lines 44-46 and column 6, lines 7-19 of Yazaki).

As such, and for these reasons at least, Claim 1 is clearly novel over Yazaki. The dependent claims, by virtue of their dependencies at least, are also novel over Yazaki.

Yazaki provides neither teaching nor suggestion of all the features of Claim 1. For example, there is no disclosure of classifying an incoming packet according to its priority based on predefined rules to produce a lifetime value associated with the packet, sending the associated lifetime value to a queue, or periodically changing the lifetime value and comparing the changed value to a threshold value. Therefore, there simply is no logical adaptation of Yazaki by which a person skilled in the art could arrive at Claim 1.

Thus, claim 1 is non-obvious over Yazaki. The dependent claims, by virtue of their dependencies at least, are also non-obvious over Yazaki.

Applicants ask that all claims be allowed. Please apply the one month extension of time fee in the amount of $120, and any other applicable charges or credits, to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 17, 2006

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10684122.doc